## Jenkens & Gilchrist

2200 ONE AMERICAN CENTER **600 CONGRESS AVENUE** AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

FROM THE DESK OF. Constance M Pielech

(512) 499-3800 FACSIMILE (512) 404-3520

www.jenkens.com

CHICAGO ILLINOIS DALLAS, TEXAS HOUSTON, TEXAS LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA NEW YORK, NEW YORK SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS WASHINGTON, D.C

COMPANY

FAX NO.

PHONE NO. 703-308-2526

Christine Scientierny

RECIPIENT

Ì.

**USPTO** 

703-872-9743

· MESSAGE ·

The complete reply is being faxed again.

#### NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

The information contained in and transmitted with this facsimile is

- SUBJECT TO THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE;
- 2. ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT; OR
- 3. CONFIDENTIAL.

It is intended only for the individual or entity designated above. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or use of or reliance upon the information contained in and transmitted with this facsimile by or to anyone other than the recipient designated above by the sender is unauthorized and strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify Jenkens & Gilchrist, a professional corporation by telephone at (512) 404-3889 immediately. Any facsimile erroneously transmitted to you should be immediately returned to the sender by U.S. Mail, or if authorization is granted by the sender, destroyed

Time: 4:59 PM

Date: August 16, 2001

Emp #: 4941

Billing #: 43225.41824busp Total Pages (+ Cover): 7

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

§ Applicant: Bieser, et al. Examiner: Juska, C. ŝ Bra Serial No.: 09/032,893 § Filed: February 27, 1998 § Group No. 1771 ş Title: HOMOGENEOUSLY BRANCHED § ETHYLENE POLYMER CARPET, CARPET BACKING AND METHOD ŝ ş FOR MAKING SAME CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL "EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No EK287121932US
Date of Deposit July 25, 2001 Assistant Commissioner for Patents Date of Deposit Washington, DC 20231 Lherepy certify that this paper, including the documents referred to therein, or fee is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1 10 Dear Sir: on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Parents, Washington, D.C. 20231 Type or Print Name: Kam Kennedy

## REPLY TO NOTICE OF IMPROPER REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE) MAILED JUNE 28, 2001

Signature

In response to the Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination mailed June 28, 2001, the Applicants are treating the notice as an Office Action requiring the complete submission of the previous response. Therefore this reply is timely filed.

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 9-12 are pending in this application. The Applicants are replying to the Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination as an Office Action requiring the complete submission of the previous response. The Applicants filed a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) Request Transmittal on May 30, 2001 in response to a non-final Office Action mailed on November 30, 2000. The CPA Request Transmittal was treated as an RCE because the CPA was filed on an application that was filed on or after May 29, 2000. As such, the CPA was turned into an RCE and the RCE was incomplete since no submission was filed with it. Under MPEP § 714.03, where a reply is a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action, but contains an

omission, the Examiner should, if there is insufficient time remaining, issue an Office Action setting a one-month time period to complete the reply pursuant to 37 C F R. § 1 135(c) The Applicants respectfully submit that the following is a complete response to the Office Action and that it is timely filed under MPEP § 714 03.

## RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 (A)

Claims 1-6 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 93/15909 issued to Fink in view of US 5,741,594 issued to Jialanella. The Examiner states.

The pending claims are rejected as being obvious over the cited Fink patent, which teaches the claimed carpet structure, in view of the cited Jialanella patent, which discloses the specific adhesive. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the Jialanella homogeneously branched polyethylene adhesive for the inermoplastic polyolefin athesive disclosed by Fink. Motivation to do so would be the explicitly teaching by Jialanella that said adhesive is suitable for carpet backings.

Office Action of November 30, 2000, page 4-5.

Applicants have reviewed the above references and respectfully disagree that the above references render the claimed invention obvious. Applicants' reasons are stated as follows

### A. Applicable Law.

To reject claims of an application under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), an examiner has the burden of establishing an unrebutted prima facie case of obviousness. See In re Deuel, 51 F.3d 1552, 1557, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1210, 1214 (Fed. Cir. 1995). In the absence of a proper prima facie case of obviousness, an applicant who complies with the other statutory requirements is entitled to a patent. See In re. Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). One important indication of non-obviousness is the "reaching away" from the claimed invention by the prior art or by experts in the art at or after the time the invention was made. See. U.S. v. Adams, 383 U.S.39 (1966).

Teaching away is the antithesis of the art's suggesting that the person of ordinary skill go in the claimed direction. Teaching away from the art is a per se demonstration of lack of prima facte obviousness. See In re. Dow Chemical Co., 837 F 2d 469, 5 USPQ2d 1529 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re.

Fine, 837 F 2d 1071, 5 UPSQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), In re Nielson, 816 F.2d 1567, 2 USPQ2d 1525 (Fed. Cir. 1987)

### B. Application of the Law.

# 1. Claims 1-6 and 9-12 are not rendered obvious by *Fink and Jialanella* because Fink teaches away from using polyethylene as an adhesive backing.

Claims 1-6 and 9-12 are directed to a carpet including (a) a primary backing, (b) a plurality of fibers attached to the primary backing, (c) an adhesive backing, (d) an optional secondary backing adjacent to the adhesive backing, wherein the adhesive backing is comprised of at least one homogeneously branched ethylene polymer characterized as having a short chain branching index (SCBDI) of greater than or equal to 50% and is in intimate contact with the primary backing and has substantially penetrated and substantially consolidated fibers.

Fink discloses a carpet including a primary backing having tufts of synthetic carpet fibers protruding from a top surface and optionally, a secondary backing with an extruded sheet of an isotactic polyolefin polymer between and integrally fused to a bottom surface of the primary backing and an upper surface of the secondary backing. It provides a list of compositions that may or may not be suitable for use in the extruded sheet. See Fink, Table A, page 20. One of the properties listed is the expected bonding strength with polypropylene. Four groups of materials were investigated, polypropylene, polyethylene, polybutylene, and elastomene alloy TPE's. All polyethylene examples have poor bond strength, except for polyethylene ionomer. According to Fink, polyethylene (other than its ionomers) is not suitable for adhesively bonding rufted carpet to the primary backing. Given the uniform unacceptability of polyethylene polymers in Fink's disclosure, one of ordinary skill in the art would not experiment with additional polyethylene polymers for use in extrusion backed carpet applications. Therefore, Fink does not teach or suggest the use of a homogeneously branched ethylene polymers as the extruded sheet, but actually teaches away from using homogeneously branched ethylene polymers as the extruded sheet. Because Fink teaches away from using ethylene polymers, it cannot be properly combined with Jialanella

requirements is entitled to a patent. The Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is non-obvious and thus patentable.

#### CONCLUSION

The Applicants have addressed all of the Examiner's rejections and believe that the claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner grant such an action. If any questions or issues remain in the resolution of which the Examiner feels will be advanced by a conference with the Applicants' attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the attorney at the number noted below.

No fee is believed to be required for this submission. Should there be any additional fees required, please charge such additional fees to Deposit Account 10-0447, reference 43225.41824BUSP(BAI).

Respectfully submitted,

JENKENS & GILCHRIST A Professional Corporation

J. Benjamin Bai, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 43,481

= 1103 a

Jenkens & Gilchrist, A Professional Corporation 1100 Louisiana St., Ste. 1800 Houston, Texas 77002

Telephone: (713) 951-3387

Fax: (713) 951-3314

	43225.413248USP
PATENT AT	TORNEY DOCKET NO .: 4522.
Applicant: BIESET, et al Tule: HOMOGENEOUSLY ERANCI CARPET, CARPET BACKING	HED FTHYLENE POLYMER AND METHOD FOR MAKING SAME
Transminal Lener	Appeal Brief (S tolpart)     Exhibits
Small Felier Resman & Gilchrist	Certificate of Mailing 3/CR : Copy of Nature  NOther 103+10-00; Copy of Nature  OF IMP. RED VEST
	Chemical Dasc 7/25/01

ay